arXiv:1304.1270v3 [astro-ph.CO] 22 May 2013

The CMB asymmetry from inflation

David H. Lyth
Consortium for Fundamental Physics,
Cosmology and Astroparticle Group, Department of Physics,
Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YB, UK

May 23, 2013

Abstract

Erickcek, Kamionkowski and Carroll proposed in 2008 that the hemispherical asymmetry of the CMB could be due to a very large scale perturbation of the field ϕ causing the primordial curvature perturbation. We repeat their calculation using weaker assumptions and the current data. If ϕ is the inflaton of *any* single-field inflation with the attractor behaviour, the asymmetry is too small. If instead ϕ is *any* curvaton-type field (ie. one with the canonical kinetic term and a negligible effect during inflation) the asymmetry can agree with observation if $|f_{\rm NL}|$ in the equilateral configuration is $\simeq 10$ for $k^{-1} = 1\,{\rm Gpc}$ and $\lesssim 3$ for $k^{-1} = 1\,{\rm Mpc}$. An $f_{\rm NL}$ with these properties can apparently be obtained from the curvaton with an axionic potential. Within any specific curvaton-type model, the function $f_{\rm NL}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ required to generate the asymmetry would be determined, and could perhaps already be confirmed or ruled out using existing Planck or WMAP data.

1 Introduction

In 1978 Grishchuk and Zel'dovich investigated the effect of a very large-scale enhancement of the spectrum of the primordial curvature perturbation, upon the CMB anisotropy [1]. Within the observable universe the enhancement is expected to give an approximately linear function of position, but the linear component has no effect upon the observed CMB anisotropy. The leading observable effect is expected to come from the component that is a quadratic function of position; it gives an enhancement to the CMB quadrupole, called the Grishchuk-Zel'dovich effect, which is not observed leading to an upper bound on the magnitude of the quadratic component.

According to present thinking the primordial density perturbation comes from the perturbation of some field ϕ, which is generated from the vacuum fluctuation during inflation.[1] We are therefore talking about a very large scale contribution to the spectrum of ϕ. This will generate a contribution to the spectrum of the curvature perturbation, giving the GZ effect, but it will also generate a very large scale contribution $\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x})$ to ϕ. As was pointed out by Erickcek, Kamionkowski and Carroll (EKC) in 2008 [2], the *linear* component of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$ can have two potentially observable effects. One, that I will call the EKC effect is to generate statistical inhomogeneity in ζ within the observable universe which in turn will generate a hemispherical asymmetry of the CMB anisotropy. There is now convincing evidence for this asymmetry on large scales [3, 4]. The other is a new contribution to the GZ effect, which is proportional to the generated asymmetry. Barring a cancellation, the upper bound on the GZ effect implies, within a given model for the generation of ζ, an upper bound on the asymmetry.

EKC looked at two possibilities for ϕ; that it is the inflaton of slow-roll inflation or that it is the curvaton [5] with a quadratic potential. In this paper we allow ϕ to be either the inflaton of *any* single-field model of inflation with the attractor behaviour [6], or *any* curvaton-type field. The latter could be the curvaton with a generic potential or more generally any field with the canonical kinetic term which has a negligible effect during inflation.

2 Asymmetry from anisotropy

The CMB exhibits statistical anisotropy on large angular scales $\Delta\theta \gtrsim 1/60$ corresponding to multipoles with $\ell \lesssim 60$. The data are consistent with a hemispherical asymmetry of a statistically isotropic quantity $\Delta T_{\rm iso}$:[3, 4]

$$\Delta T(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) = (1 + A\hat{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{n}})\,\Delta T_{\rm iso}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}), \tag{1}$$

where the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the direction in the sky, the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ is the hemispherical direction and $|A| = 0.07 \pm 0.02$.[2] 'Statistically isotropic' means that the correlators of $\Delta T_{\rm iso}$ within a disk on the sky are independent of the location of that disc.

The dominant contribution (at least) to ΔT comes from the primordial curvature perturbation ζ, and we assume that the asymmetry of ΔT comes from statistical inhomogeneity of ζ within the observable universe. Since ΔT depends mostly on conditions at the last scattering surface at distance $x_{\rm ls} = 14\,{\rm Gpc}$ we need

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + A(k)\hat{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\mathbf{x}/x_{\rm ls} + \cdots)\,\zeta_{h\mathbf{k}}, \tag{2}$$

---

[1] The perturbations of two or more fields might be involved but we do not consider that possibility.

[2] On a given scale we can make A positive by the choice of $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$, but we want to allow for a possible change in sign of A going from large to small scales, and to allow the simplest presentation of the calculation we will not demand that A is positive on large scales.

where ζ_h is the statistically homogeneous and isotropic perturbation that generates $\Delta T_{\rm iso}(\hat{\mathbf{n}})$. The spectrum of $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,\mathbf{x}) = \left(1 + A(k)\hat{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\mathbf{x}/x_{\rm ls} + \cdots\right)\mathcal{P}_{\zeta h}^{1/2}(k), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta h}(k)$ is the spectrum of ζ_h. The dots in Eqs. (2) and (3) indicate contributions of higher order in $\mathbf{x}$, that must be smaller than the linear term for $x < x_{\rm ls}$. An equivalent definition of of $A(k)$ is

$$\frac{A(k)}{x_{\rm ls}} = \frac{|\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,0)|}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,0)}. \tag{4}$$

CMB multipoles of order ℓ probe $k \sim \ell/x_{\rm ls}$ and for k^{-1} in the range $x_{\rm ls}/60$ to $x_{\rm ls}$, and we need $|A(k)| = 0.07 \pm 0.02$. On the much smaller scale $k^{-1} \sim 1\,\mathrm{Mpc}$ the distribution of distant quasars requires $|A(k)| < 0.015$ (99% confidence level) [7]. Therefore, if the hemispherical asymmetry of ΔT is generated by the hemispherical asymmetry of ζ, we should write instead of Eq. (1)

$$\Delta T(\hat{\mathbf{n}}) = \left(1 + A(k)\hat{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{n}}\right)\Delta T_{\rm iso}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}), \tag{5}$$

the expression applying for multipoles $\ell \simeq x_{\rm ls}k$ or equivalently angular scales $\Delta\theta \simeq (x_{\rm ls}k)^{-1}$.

Before continuing, we need to be precise about the meaning of Eqs. (2) and (3). Statistically homogeneous cosmological perturbations should be described using a finite box [8]. Correlators are defined as spatial averages within the box so that for example $\langle\zeta_{\rm h}(\mathbf{y})\zeta_{\rm h}(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})\rangle$ is the average over $\mathbf{y}$. From now on we assume statistical isotropy which means that the correlators are invariant under rotations. Cosmic variance is the mean square difference, between the correlator and what can actually be observed.

Within the box one uses a Fourier series that is approximated as a Fourier integral. The region of interest should fit comfortably into the box so that physically significant wavenumbers satisfy $kL \gg 1$ where L is the box size. For a generic perturbation

$$g_{\mathbf{k}} = \int g(\mathbf{x})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}d^3x. \tag{6}$$

The spectrum is defined by

$$\langle g_{\mathbf{k}}g_{\mathbf{k}'}\rangle = (2\pi)^3\delta^3(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}')(k^3/2\pi^2)\mathcal{P}_g(k), \tag{7}$$

and the bispectrum by

$$\langle g_{\mathbf{k}_1}g_{\mathbf{k}_2}g_{\mathbf{k}_3}\rangle = (2\pi^3)\delta^3(\mathbf{k}_1+\mathbf{k}_2+\mathbf{k}_3)B_g(k_1,k_2,k_3). \tag{8}$$

In [8] it is proposed that the box size for cosmology should usually be the smallest one that comfortably contains the observable universe. Demanding say one percent accuracy the 'minimal box' size is presumably $L \sim 100x_{\rm ls}$ corresponding to $\ln(L/x_{\rm ls}) \sim 5$. The use of the minimal box avoids assumptions about inflation long before the observable universe leaves the horizon, and minimizes the cosmic variance [8].

The minimal box is appropriate when considering a statistically homogeneous perturbation which is the usual situation. In our case, it is appropriate for the description of ζ_h. But to describe the statistically inhomogeneous perturbation $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$, one should in a small box centred on $\mathbf{x}$ with size much smaller than $x_{\rm ls}$. Within the box, $\mathbf{x}$ can be regarded as constant and $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be regarded as a statistically homogeneous perturbation with spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k,\mathbf{x})$. The quantity $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined only for $1/k \ll x_{\rm ls}$ which means that it can only be used to describe ΔT on angular scales $\ll 1$ corresponding to multipoles $\gg 1$. That is as it should be, because the definition of $\Delta T_{\rm iso}$ given after Eq. (1) makes sense only on these scales.

Going to the other extreme, one can assume that the inflated patch around us is big enough to allow the use of a big box containing all significant wavelengths of $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ considered as a function of $\mathbf{x}$ (equivalently, all significant wavelengths of the perturbation $\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x})$)). Within such a box, ζ is statistically homogeneous, and $\langle\delta\phi_{\rm L}\rangle = 0$ which means that the value of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$ within the observable universe comes from cosmic variance.

In this paper we first recall the generation of ζ without statistical inhomogeneity, using a minimal box and focussing on the possibility of scale-dependent non-gaussianity $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)$. Then we see how to generate the statistically inhomogeneous quantity $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$ using a small box. Finally, we consider a big box which allows one to treat the total GZ effect and not just the EKC contribution to it.

3 Generating ζ without statistical inhomogeneity

In this section we recall the standard description of ζ and its generation from the perturbation of some field ϕ. The description invokes a minimal box, and in the presence of statistical inhomogeneity it applies to ζ_h but we will drop the subscript h.

We begin with the definition of ζ, which makes no reference to its stochastic properties (and therefore invokes no box). The curvature perturbation ζ is taken to be smooth on some comoving scale $x_{\rm smooth}$ that is shorter than any of interest (ie. it is taken to only have modes with $k \lesssim x_{\rm smooth}^{-1}$).[3] Also, ζ is defined only while the smoothing scale is outside the horizon ($x_{\rm smooth} \gg 1/aH$). Using the comoving threads of spacetime and the slices of constant energy density, ζ

---

[3] To be more precise its gradient is $\lesssim x_{\rm smooth}^{-1}$. We are not really invoking a Fourier transform here but use k for ease of presentation. The same device will be used later without comment.

is defined by

$$\zeta(\mathbf{x},t) \equiv \delta(\ln a(\mathbf{x},t)) \equiv \ln[a(\mathbf{x},t)] - \ln[a(t)], \tag{9}$$

where $a(\mathbf{x},t)$ is the scale factor such that a comoving volume element has volume $\propto a^3$. Here $a(t)$ is the scale factor in the background universe that is invoked to define perturbations.

In the early universe ζ may be time-dependent, but if we take the smoothing scale to be the shortest cosmological scale it has reached some time-independent value $\zeta(\mathbf{x})$ at least by the time that the smoothing scale is approaching horizon entry. (By 'cosmological scales' we mean those that are probed by the CMB anisotropy and galaxy surveys, corresponding $e^{-15}x_{\rm ls} < k^{-1} < x_{\rm ls}$.) If ϕ is the inflaton of single-field inflation, ζ already has the final value soon after $x_{\rm smooth}$ leaves the horizon; in the opposite case that ϕ is a curvaton-type field the final value is reached only at some epoch after inflation.

Working now in a box of at least minimal size, and assuming that we live at a typical location, observation [9, 10] gives $\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2} \simeq 5\times 10^{-5}$ and

$$\frac{n(k)-1}{2} \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k)}\frac{d\mathcal{P}^{1/2}(k)}{d\ln k} = -0.040 \pm 0.007. \tag{10}$$

The bispectrum of ζ is specified by

$$f_{\rm NL}(k_1,k_2,k_3) \equiv \frac{5}{6}\frac{B_\zeta(k_1,k_2,k_3)}{P_\zeta(k_1)P_\zeta(k_2) + 2\,\text{perms}}, \tag{11}$$

where $P_\zeta \equiv (k^3/2\pi^2)\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$, If $f_{\rm NL}$ is independent of k_i then [11] $f_{\rm NL} = 2.7 \pm 5.8$, but the bound is much weaker for generic k_i, roughly $|f_{\rm NL}| \lesssim 100$. If $|f_{\rm NL}| \gtrsim 1$ it will eventually be detected.

For the rest of this section we work in a minimal box. Except where stated we assume that ϕ has the canonical kinetic term after the box leaves the horizon. Then $\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}$ is created from the vacuum fluctuation at the epoch of horizon exit $aH = k$. The spectrum is initially $\mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k) = (H/2\pi)^2$.

The curvature perturbation $\zeta(\mathbf{x},t)$ generated by ϕ is given by the non-linear δN formula [12, 13]

$$\zeta(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \delta(\ln a(\mathbf{x},t)) = \delta(\ln a(\mathbf{x},t)/a(t_1)) \equiv \delta N(\phi(\mathbf{x},t_1)). \tag{12}$$

The function $N(\phi(\mathbf{x},t_1))$ is the number of e-folds of expansion at position $\mathbf{x}$ between a time t_1 during inflation after the smoothing scale has left the horizon, with ϕ has the assigned value, and a time t at which the energy density has a fixed value. The field $\phi(\mathbf{x},t_1)$ is defined on a 'flat' slice of spacetime (one on which the scale factor has a fixed value), and ζ is independent of the choice of t_1.

The field is written

$$\phi(\mathbf{x},t) = \phi_0(t) + \delta\phi(\mathbf{x},t). \tag{13}$$

Expanding Eq. (12) gives [13]

$$\zeta(\mathbf{x}) = N'(\phi_0(t_1))\delta\phi(\mathbf{x}, t_1) + \frac{1}{2}N''(\phi_0(t_1))(\delta\phi(\mathbf{x}, t_1))^2. \tag{14}$$

Since ζ is nearly gaussian, the first term dominates giving

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = N'^2(\phi_0(t_1))(H(t_1)/2\pi)^2. \tag{15}$$

Including the second term, $f_{\rm NL}$ is given by [13, 14]

$$\frac{6}{5}f_{\rm NL}(k_1, k_2, k_3) = \frac{N''(t_1)}{N'^2(t_1)} + \frac{(2\pi)^3 N'^3(t_1) B_{\delta\phi}(k_1, k_2, k_3, t_1)}{P_\zeta(k_1)P_(k_2) + 2\text{perms}}. \tag{16}$$

For our purpose we can set $t_1 = t_k$ where t_k is (just after) horizon crossing for a scale k which is taken to be the smoothing scale. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = N'^2(\phi_0(t_k))(H(t_k)/2\pi)^2, \tag{17}$$

and

$$f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k) = \frac{5}{6}N''(\phi_0(t_k))/N'^2(\phi_0(t_k)), \tag{18}$$

where $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k) \equiv f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k, k, k)$ and the superscript qlocal (quasi-local) means that $\delta\phi$ is taken to be gaussian at horizon exit so that $B_{\delta\phi}(k, k, k, t_k) = 0$. (If $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}$ is independent of k it is called the local contribution.)

We suppose first that ϕ is the inflaton of slow-roll inflation [15]. In this case, $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$ achieves its final value promptly at $t = t_k$, which means that

$$\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x}) = H(t_k)(\delta t)_{\mathbf{k}} = -H(t_k)\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(t_k)/\dot{\phi}_0(t_k), \tag{19}$$

where δt is the displacement of the slice of uniform energy density from the flat slice on which $\delta\phi$ is defined, and the second equality is valid to first order in $\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) &= \left(\frac{H(t_k)}{\dot{\phi}_0(t_k)}\right)^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k, t_k) & (20) \\ \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k, t_k) &= \left(\frac{H(t_k)}{2\pi}\right)^2. & (21) \end{aligned}$$

The slow-roll approximation corresponds to conditions on the scalar field potential, $\epsilon \ll 1$ and $|\eta| \ll 1$ where $\epsilon \equiv M_{\rm P}^2(V'/V)^2/2$ and $\eta \equiv M_{\rm P}^2 V''/V$, and

$$\dot{\phi}_0(t_k) \simeq -V'(\phi_0(t_k)/3H(t_k). \tag{22}$$

These imply

$$3M_{\rm P}^2 H^2(t_k) \simeq V(\phi_0(t_k)). \tag{23}$$

These equations make $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ a function of $\phi_0(t_k)$. Using $k = a(t_k)H(t_k)$ and the good approximation $d\ln k \simeq d\ln a = Hdt$ this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n(k)-1}{2} &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k)} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k)}{d\phi} \frac{\dot\phi}{H} && (24) \\ &\simeq \eta(t_k) - 3\epsilon(t_k). && (25) \end{aligned}$$

Evaluating Eq. (18) gives

$$\frac{6}{5} f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k) \simeq 2\epsilon(t_k) - \eta(t_k). \tag{26}$$

Barring a fine-tuned cancellation

$$|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)| \sim 1 - n(k) \tag{27}$$

and in any case $|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}| \ll 1$. These expressions assume $B_{\delta\phi}(k,k,k,t_k) = 0$, which is not a good approximation with ϕ the inflaton because the first term of Eq. (16) is also very small. The full $f_{\rm NL}$ [16] still satisfies $|f_{\rm NL}| \ll 1$ but we don't need it.

Instead of slow-roll inflation one can consider the very general single-field inflation paradigm given in [6], that includes the special case of k-inflation and within that the special case of DBI inflation. Within this paradigm, the epoch t_k at which $\delta\phi$ is created from the vacuum corresponds to $c_{\rm s}k = aH$ with $c_{\rm s} \neq 1$, but $c_{\rm s}$ varies slowly on the Hubble timescale so that we still have $d\ln k \simeq Hdt$. Also, Eqs. (19) and (20) still apply. Now comes the crucial point. Although Eqs. (21)–(23) no longer apply, $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ is still a function of $\phi_0(t_k)$ which means that $n(k)-1$ and $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)$ are functions of $\phi_0(t_k)$. Also, barring a cancellation, Eq. (27) is still valid. The crucial *difference* from the slow-roll case is that $\delta\phi$ is typically very non-gaussian, making the full $f_{\rm NL}$ easily big enough to observe (or to have already observed, constraining the model). As we will see though, all we need is Eq. (27).

Consider now the case that ϕ is a a curvaton-type field. In this case one expects barring cancellations $|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)| \gtrsim 1$, which we will assume. (As we will see, $|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)| \sim 10$ is actually required to generate the required asymmetry for $k^{-1} \sim$ Gpc.) Then $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}$ is practically equal to the full quantity $f_{\rm NL}$ [17] and we will identify them. Also, the evolution of $\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}$ after horizon exit is given by

$$H(t)\dot{\delta\phi}_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = -V''(\phi_0(t))\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(t) - \frac{1}{2}V'''(\phi_0(t))[(\delta\phi(t))^2]_{\mathbf{k}} - \cdots . \tag{28}$$

If V is quadratic, the evolution is linear and $f_{\rm NL}$ is a constant. We will be interested though, in the case that V''' is significant leading to a non-trivial function $f_{\rm NL}$.

4 Calculating ζ with the asymmetry

Now we write

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{x},t) &= \phi_0(\mathbf{x},t)+\delta\phi(\mathbf{x},t) && (29)\\ \phi_0(\mathbf{x},t) &= \phi_0(t)+\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t), && (30) \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta\phi$ has $k^{-1}\lesssim x_{\rm ls}$ and $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$ has $k^{-1}\gg x_{\rm ls}$. For the curvature perturbation we write

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\mathbf{x}) &= \zeta_{\rm S}(\mathbf{x})+\zeta_{\rm GZ}(\mathbf{x}) && (31)\\ \zeta_{\rm S}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv N(\phi(\mathbf{x},t_k))-N(\phi_0(\mathbf{x},t_k))\simeq N'(\phi_0(\mathbf{x},t_k))\delta\phi(\mathbf{x},t_k) && (32)\\ \zeta_{\rm GZ}(\mathbf{x}) &\equiv N(\phi_0(\mathbf{x},t_k))-N(\phi_0(t_k)) && (33)\\ &\simeq N'(\phi_0(t_k))\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k)+\frac{1}{2}N''(\phi_0(t_k))\left(\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k)\right)^2 && (34)\\ &\equiv \zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm original}(\mathbf{x},t_k)+\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm EKC}(\mathbf{x},t_k). && (35) \end{aligned}$$

Each of the contributions $\zeta_{\rm S}$ and $\zeta_{\rm GZ}$ is independent of t_k because they vary on different scales and ζ itself is independent of t_k. As we will see, the first term of Eq. (34) dominates which means that $\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k)\propto 1/N'(\phi_0(t_k))$, which from Eq. (17) is proportional to $H(t_k)$. Analogously with Eqs. (3) and (4) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k) &= B(k)(H(t_k)/2\pi)\hat{\mathbf{p}}\cdot\mathbf{x}/x_{\rm ls}+\cdots && (36)\\ (H(t_k)/2\pi)B(k)/x_{\rm ls} &\equiv |\boldsymbol{\nabla}(\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k))|_{\rm x=0}. && (37) \end{aligned}$$

(Remember that t_k is a function of k so that either can be used as an argument.)

The term $\zeta_{\rm GZ}$ generates the GZ effect. The contribution $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm original}$ does this through part of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$ that is quadratic in $\mathbf{x}$ (the linear part having $\mathbf{x}$ having no observable effect). The term $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm EKC}$ does it through the linear part of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$, and was found for the first time in [2] in the special case of the curvaton with a quadratic potential.[4] Inserting Eq. (36) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm EKC}(\mathbf{x},t_k) &= \frac{1}{2}N''(\phi_0(t_k))B^2(H(t_k)/2\pi)^2x_{\rm ls}^{-2}(\mathbf{x}\cdot\hat{p})^2 && (38)\\ &= \frac{3}{5}f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)x_{\rm ls}^{-2}(\mathbf{x}\cdot\hat{p})^2. && (39) \end{aligned}$$

We see that $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm EKC}$ is time-dependent if $f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)$ depends on k corresponding to non-linear evolution of $\delta\phi_{\mathbf{k}}$. In that case the quadratic part of $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm original}$ must have a time-dependent piece which cancels $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm EKC}$, but that places no restriction on the total quadratic part of $\zeta_{\rm GZ}^{\rm original}$.

Using Eqs (2)–(4) of [2] with $\Phi=-(3/5)\zeta$, the EKC contribution to the quadrupole is given by

$$f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)=2.2\times10^{-4}\left(\frac{|a_{20}^{\rm EKC}|}{1.8\times10^{-5}}\right), \qquad (40)$$

---

[4] I thank A. Erickcek for pointing out the absence of this term in an earlier version of the present paper.

Barring a cancellation, $|a_{20}^{\rm EKC}|$ should be $\lesssim$ the observed $|a_{20}|$ with the polar axis along the $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$ direction. That has yet to be extracted from the data, and EKC required instead that $|a_{20}^{\rm EKC}|$ be less than 3 times the rms value of $a_{\ell m}$ found in [18] corresponding to $|a_{20}^{\rm EKC}| < 1.8\times 10^{-5}$. We adopt this bound so that

$$f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)B^2 < 2.2\times 10^{-4}. \qquad (41)$$

Using Eqs. (17) and (36), this gives

$$|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)N'(\phi_0(t_k))\delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x},t_k)| < \sqrt{2.2\times 10^{-4}|f_{\rm NL}^{\rm qlocal}(k)|} \lesssim 10^{-1}, \qquad (42)$$

which means that the first term of $\zeta_{\rm GZ}$ dominates as advertised.

The term $\zeta_{\rm S}$ comes from the perturbation $\delta\phi$, and evaluated in a small box centred at position $\mathbf{x}$ it gives

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k,\mathbf{x}) = N'^2(\phi_0(\mathbf{x},t_k))((H(\mathbf{x},t_k)/2\pi)^2, \qquad (43)$$

where $H(\mathbf{x},t)\equiv \dot{a}(\mathbf{x},t)/a(\mathbf{x},t)$ is the unperturbed quantity within the small box. After insertion into Eq. (4), this gives $A(k)$.

We consider first the case that ϕ is the inflaton of slow-roll inflation, or the inflaton within the class of models in [6]. Then $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k,\mathbf{x})$ is a function of $\phi_0(\mathbf{x},t_k)$ and using Eq. (24) we have

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,0)}{\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,0)} = \frac{(n(k)-1)}{2}\frac{H(t_k)}{\dot{\phi}_0(t_k)}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\phi(0,t_k). \qquad (44)$$

Using Eqs. (4) and (37) this gives

$$A(k) = \frac{n(k)-1}{2}B\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k), \qquad (45)$$

and Eqs. (41) and (27) give

$$|A(k)| \lesssim 10^{-2}\sqrt{1-n(k)} = 0.002, \qquad (46)$$

which is too small.

Now suppose instead that ϕ is a curvaton-type field. Since ϕ has a negligible effect during inflation, $H(\mathbf{x},t_k)$ is independent of $\mathbf{x}$ and Eq. (43) gives

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,\mathbf{x}) = \left[1+\left(\frac{N''(\phi_0(t_k))}{N'(\phi_0(t_k))}\right)\left(\frac{BH(t_k)/2\pi}{x_{\rm ls}}\right)\hat{p}\cdot\mathbf{x}\right]\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k,0) \qquad (47)$$

so that

$$A(k) = \frac{6}{5}f_{\rm NL}(k)B\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k). \qquad (48)$$

Using Eq. (41),

$$|A(k)| \lesssim 0.018|f_{\rm NL}(k)|^{1/2}. \qquad (49)$$

To have $|A(k)| = 0.07 \pm 0.02$ on the Gpc scale we need $|f_{\rm NL}(k)| > 8$ on that scale. A tight observational bound on $f_{\rm NL}(k)$ could be obtained using a shape for $f_{\rm NL}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ derived within a specific curvaton-type model (see [14, 19] for the curvaton) but with current data it is unlikely to be tighter than the result $|f_{\rm NL}| \sim 10$ that holds if $f_{\rm NL}$ is a constant. We conclude that the linear GZ effect can account for the CMB asymmetry if ζ is generated by a curvaton-type field.

5 The view from a big box

In this section we work in a box big enough to enclose all significant wavelengths of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$. The view from such a box is of interest in its own right, but our main purpose is to see whether the total GZ contribution to the quadrupole might be bigger than the EKC contribution, which would tighten the bound on $A(k)$.

We write the curvature perturbation as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\mathbf{x}) &= \zeta_{\rm linear}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{3}{5} f_{\rm NL}(k_1) \zeta^2_{\rm linear}(\mathbf{x}) && (50) \\ \zeta_{\rm linear}(\mathbf{x}) &= N'(\phi_0(t_1)) \left(\delta\phi(\mathbf{x}, t_1) + \delta\phi_{\rm L}(\mathbf{x}, t_1) \right), && (51) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\rm NL}(k_1)$ is defined by Eq. (18). We take t_1 as the epoch of horizon exit for the scale $k_1^{-1} = 1\,{\rm Gpc}$ and demand $|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)| \gtrsim 10$ so that a curvaton-type model can generate the asymmetry.

Within the box, ζ is statistically homogeneous. For the CMB multipoles,

$$C_\ell \equiv \langle a^2_{\ell m} \rangle = 4\pi \int_0^\infty T^2_\ell(k) \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) dk/k, \qquad (52)$$

where $T_\ell(k)$ is ~ 1 for $k^{-1} \sim x_{\rm ls}$ and close to 1 for $k^{-1} \gg x_{\rm ls}$.

To obtain an expression for $\langle B^2 \rangle$ we assume $\zeta \simeq \zeta_{\rm linear}$ corresponding to

$$|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)| \langle \zeta^2 \rangle = |f_{\rm NL}(k_1)| \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k} \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) \ll 1. \qquad (53)$$

That is not a very strong assumption because we anyway require $\langle \zeta^2 \rangle \lesssim 1$. (A bigger value would correspond to a strong distortion of the geometry, so that $\mathbf{x}$ would no longer corresponded to a distance [20], invalidating the definition of ζ in terms of the perturbation of the scale factor of the universe.) With this assumption, $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = N'^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k)$ for $k \gtrsim x_{\rm ls}^{-1}$, and $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = N'^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi_{\rm L}}(k)$ for k less than some $k_{\rm L} \ll x_{\rm ls}$.

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (37) by N', squaring them gives

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1) \langle B^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty \frac{dk}{k} (x_{\rm ls} k)^2 \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k). \qquad (54)$$

We will assume, as usual, that our location is typical. Then observation gives $\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-5}$ for $k^{-1} \gtrsim x_{\rm ls}$. Also, up to cosmic variance, Eq. (52)

should be satisfied with $\langle|a_{\ell m}|^2\rangle$ equal to the observed quantities and we should have $B^2 \simeq \langle B^2\rangle$.

If $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ did not increase sharply at $k^{-1} \ll x_{\rm ls}$, the contribution from that regime to Eqs. (52) and (54) would be negligible. There would be no GZ effect and no EKC effect. We therefore assume that $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ does increase sharply, so that Eqs. (52) and (54) are dominated by the regime $k < k_{\rm L}$.

The bispectrum of ζ within the big box is given by Eqs. (11) and (16) except that $\delta\phi$ in the second term of Eq. (16) is now replaced by $\delta\phi + \delta\phi_{\rm L}$. That term is presumably far from negligible, because $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$ must evolve strongly after horizon exit for the scales $k < k_{\rm L}$, but it cannot be calculated without knowing the potential and kinetic term of $\delta\phi_{\rm L}$. The same applies to higher correlators within the big box; ζ is presumably very non-gaussian but the size and nature of this non-gaussianity is not known.

The observed asymmetry corresponds to a systematic bias of the observed $a^2_{\ell m}$ away from C_ℓ, and Eq. (54) will ensure that the bias is allowed by the cosmic variance of C_ℓ. On the other hand, since the non-gaussianity of ζ is unknown the cosmic variance cannot actually be calculated. Presumably, Eq. (54) is providing some lower bound on the cosmic variance but it is not quite clear how that would come about. An investigation of this issue would perhaps be interesting.

Using the Sachs-Wolfe approximation, the GZ contribution to C_2 is

$$C_2^{\rm GZ} = \frac{4\pi}{25}\int_0^{k_{\rm L}} dk \left(\frac{(kx_{\rm ls})^2}{15}\right)^2 \mathcal{P}_\zeta(k). \tag{55}$$

In the absence of any estimate of cosmic variance, we will just requiring $\sqrt{C_2^{\rm GZ}}$ to be less than three times the observed rms quadrupole, giving

$$C_2^{\rm GZ} = 2.2\times10^{-3}\int_0^{k_{\rm L}} \frac{dk}{k}(kx_{\rm ls})^4\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) < (1.8\times10^{-5})^2. \tag{56}$$

Without specifying $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ we have only

$$\frac{C_2^{\rm GZ}}{2.2\times10^{-3}}\frac{1}{(k_{\rm L}x_{\rm ls})^4} < B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1)\frac{1}{(k_{\rm L}x_{\rm ls})^2}. \tag{57}$$

Then the upper bound on $C_2^{\rm GZ}$ tells us nothing about B.

When discussing the GZ effect, it's often assumed that the large-scale contribution to $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ peaks at some k. Denoting that k by $k_{\rm L}$, and using Eq. (54) with $B^2 = \langle B^2\rangle$, we then have

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) \simeq \frac{B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1)}{(x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L})^2}\delta(\ln k - \ln k_{\rm L}). \tag{58}$$

The inequality (57) is now saturated and the upper bound (56) gives

$$(k_{\rm L}x_{\rm ls})^2B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1) \lesssim \left(3.8\times10^{-4}\right)^2. \tag{59}$$

Also, $|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)|\langle\zeta^2\rangle \ll 1$ gives

$$|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)|B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1) \ll (x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L})^2. \tag{60}$$

Taking both of the inequalities to be simply $<$, the weakest bound on B^2 is obtained for $x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L} = 2\times 10^{-2}|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)|^{1/4}$ which gives

$$B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1)\sqrt{|f_{\rm NL}|} < 4\times 10^{-4}. \tag{61}$$

This is a bit weaker than than Eq. (41), but reducing $x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L}$ by a factor of 10 gives $B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1) \lesssim 10^{-6}$ which makes $A(k_1)$ much too small. The same is true if we increase it by that factor, though this might be regarded as incompatible with $x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L} \ll 1$. Therefore, a peaked large-scale $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ allows sufficient hemispherical anisotropy only if the peak is at $k \sim 10^{-2}x_{\rm ls}$.

Instead of a strong peaking one might assume a flat plateau: the large-scale contribution to $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k)$ is constant for $N_L^{-1}\ln k_{\rm L} < \ln k < \ln k_{\rm L}$ and zero elsewhere. (That might happen if the large-scale contribution is generated at the beginning of nearly-exponential inflation that started N_L *e*-folds before $k_{\rm L}$ left the horizon.) Repeating the previous analysis one then finds that Eq. (59) is loosened by a factor 2 while Eq. (60) is tightened by a factor $1/2N_L$. The weakest bound is now for $x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L} = 3\times 10^{-2}(|f_{\rm NL}|N_L)^{1/4}$ which gives $B^2\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k_1)\sqrt{f_{\rm NL}N_L} < 4\times 10^{-4}$. With $|f_{\rm NL}(k_1)| \simeq 10$, we need $N_L \lesssim 10$ to generate the asymmetry. As before, a value of $x_{\rm ls}k_{\rm L}$ much below 10^{-2} is not allowed.

These results may be of interest within a specific mechanism for generating the large-scale $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$, but as we have seen there is no general result. The large box provides no definite constraint on the curvaton-type model for generating the hemispherical anisotropy.

I close this section by mentioning a different possibility for obtaining a spatial variation of the background field $\phi_0(\mathbf{x})$. Instead of invoking an enhancement of the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k)$, we can keep the usual fairly flat spectrum and suppose that we live at a special place within the large box. This possibility was considered in detail by Linde and Mukhanov [21], who noticed that it could generate hemispherical asymmetry of the CMB. It is not clear how easily this scheme could keep the CMB quadrupole small enough, while generating the required asymmetry.

6 Conclusion

It was disappointing, though hardly a surprise, that the GZ effect was not seen when the CMB quadrupole was first observed. The hemispherical asymmetry of the CMB anisotropy may now be making up for that disappointment, by exhibiting the closely related EKC effect.

Indeed, an alternative explanation for the asymmetry is hard to come by. After ruling out various scenarios, [22] mentions only five that might still be viable.[5] These are (i) an asymmetry of $n-1$, (ii) the asymmetric isocurvature proposal of [24], (iii) an asymmmetric tensor perturbation, (iv) an asymmetry of the optical depth, (v) bubble collisions and (vi) non-trivial topology of the Universe. Of these, the first is identical with our version of the EKC effect and the second may be in conflict with Planck bounds on the isocurvature amplitude. The next two are only partially investigated in [22] and may also be in conflict with existing data while the last two have not been tried at all.

There are two more proposals [25, 26], not mentioned in [22]. That of [25] invokes a contraction of the universe, followed by an inflationary expansion with ϕ the inflaton. On scales leaving the horizon during the contraction, $\dot{H}/H^2$ is enhanced which sufficiently enhances $A(k)$. But the enhancement applies only to scales $k^{-1} > (\mathcal{H}_0)^{-1}$ (their notation) which for their best fit corresponds to $k^{-1} > 5.4\,\text{Gpc} \sim x_{\text{ls}}/3$. That is outside the required range $x_{\text{ls}}/60 \lesssim k^{-1} \ll x_{\text{ls}}$. (At 3-$\sigma$ though, they can have $1/\mathcal{H}_0 = x_{\text{ls}}/30$ which might work. (Personal communication from Yun-Song Piao.)) The proposal of [26] replaces, during inflation, the usual Riemannian spacetime by what is called Randers spacetime. The $A(k)$ appears to be viable, with $A \propto 1/k$.[6] These proposals invoke a radical departure from usual inflationary scenario.

On the assumption that ζ is generated by some field ϕ, we have found that the EKC effect cannot generate the observed asymmetry if ϕ is the inflaton, but that it can do so if ϕ is a curvaton-type field. This is perhaps the first indication that the latter may be nature's choice. The asymmetry can agree with observation if $|f_{\text{NL}}|$ in the equilateral configuration is $\simeq 10$ for $k^{-1} = 1\,\text{Gpc}$ and $\lesssim 3$ for $k^{-1} = 1\,\text{Mpc}$. An f_{NL} with these properties can apparently be obtained from the curvaton with an axionic potential [19]. Within any specific curvaton-type model, the function $f_{\text{NL}}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ required to generate the asymmetry would be determined, and could perhaps already be confirmed or ruled out using existing Planck or WMAP data.

After the first version of this paper appeared on arXiv.org, two more papers considered the EKC effect [27, 28]. Among other things they invoke two or more curvaton-type fields. They do not include the EKC contribution to the GZ effect.

Acknowledgements

I thank Andrew Liddle for valuable comments. The work is supported by the Lancaster-Manchester-Sheffield Consortium for Fundamental Physics under STFC grant ST/J000418/1.

---

[5] They rule out the large-scale non-gaussianity proposal of [23] on the ground that it makes $A(k)$ scale-independent, but this scenario in fact generates only statistical anisotropy of $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ which cannot generate the CMB asymmetry. Figure 1 of that paper refers to $L = 2$ in their notation, not to $L = 1$ as stated in the caption. I thank Fabian Schmidt for clarification of this issue.

[6] This dependence will be explained in a future version of [26]. (Personal communication from S. Wang.)

References

[1] L. P. Grishchuk and I. B. Zel'dovich, Sov. Astron. **22** (1978) 125.

[2] A. L. Erickcek, M. Kamionkowski and S. M. Carroll, "A Hemispherical Power Asymmetry from Inflation," Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 123520 [arXiv:0806.0377 [astro-ph]]. A. L. Erickcek, S. M. Carroll and M. Kamionkowski, "Superhorizon Perturbations and the Cosmic Microwave Background," Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 083012 [arXiv:0808.1570 [astro-ph]].

[3] F. Paci, A. Gruppuso, F. Finelli, A. De Rosa, N. Mandolesi and P. Natoli, "Hemispherical power asymmetries in the WMAP 7-year low-resolution temperature and polarization maps," arXiv:1301.5195 [astro-ph.CO].

[4] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], "Planck 2013 results. XXIII. Isotropy and Statistics of the CMB," arXiv:1303.5083 [astro-ph.CO].

[5] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, "Generating the curvature perturbation without an inflaton," Phys. Lett. B **524** (2002) 5 [hep-ph/0110002].

[6] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan and L. Senatore, "The Effective Field Theory of Inflation," JHEP **0803** (2008) 014 [arXiv:0709.0293 [hep-th]].

[7] C. M. Hirata, "Constraints on cosmic hemispherical power anomalies from quasars," JCAP **0909** (2009) 011 [arXiv:0907.0703 [astro-ph.CO]].

[8] D. H. Lyth, "The curvature perturbation in a box," JCAP **0712** (2007) 016 [arXiv:0707.0361 [astro-ph]].

[9] G. Hinshaw, D. Larson, E. Komatsu, D. N. Spergel, C. L. Bennett, J. Dunkley, M. R. Nolta and M. Halpern *et al.*, "Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results," arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO].

[10] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], "Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters," arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].

[11] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], "Planck 2013 Results. XXIV. Constraints on primordial non-Gaussianity," arXiv:1303.5084 [astro-ph.CO].

[12] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, "A General analytic formula for the spectral index of the density perturbations produced during inflation," Prog. Theor. Phys. **95** (1996) 71 [astro-ph/9507001].

[13] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodriguez, "The Inflationary prediction for primordial non-Gaussianity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 121302 [astro-ph/0504045].

[14] C. T. Byrnes, S. Nurmi, G. Tasinato and D. Wands, “Scale dependence of local $f_N L$,” JCAP **1002** (2010) 034 [arXiv:0911.2780 [astro-ph.CO]].

[15] A. D. Linde, “A New Inflationary Universe Scenario: A Possible Solution of the Horizon, Flatness, Homogeneity, Isotropy and Primordial Monopole Problems,” Phys. Lett. B **108** (1982) 389; A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, “Cosmology for Grand Unified Theories with Radiatively Induced Symmetry Breaking,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1220.

[16] J. M. Maldacena, “Non-Gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models,” JHEP **0305** (2003) 013 [astro-ph/0210603]. D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, “Primordial non-Gaussianities from multiple-field inflation,” JCAP **0509** (2005) 011 [astro-ph/0506056]; D. Seery, K. A. Malik and D. H. Lyth, “Non-gaussianity of inflationary field perturbations from the field equation,” JCAP **0803** (2008) 014 [arXiv:0802.0588 [astro-ph]].

[17] D. H. Lyth and I. Zaballa, “A Bound concerning primordial non-Gaussianity,” JCAP **0510** (2005) 005 [astro-ph/0507608]; I. Zaballa, Y. Rodriguez and D. H. Lyth, “Higher order contributions to the primordial non-Gaussianity,” JCAP **0606** (2006) 013 [astro-ph/0603534].

[18] G. Efstathiou, “A Maximum likelihood analysis of the low CMB multipoles from WMAP,” Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **348** (2004) 885 [astro-ph/0310207].

[19] P. Chingangbam and Q. -G. Huang, “The Curvature Perturbation in the Axion-type Curvaton Model,” JCAP **0904** (2009) 031 [arXiv:0902.2619 [astro-ph.CO]]; Q. -G. Huang, “Negative spectral index of f_{NL} in the axion-type curvaton model,” JCAP **1011** (2010) 026 [Erratum-ibid. **1102** (2011) E01] [arXiv:1008.2641 [astro-ph.CO]]; T. Kobayashi and T. Takahashi, “Runnings in the Curvaton,” JCAP **1206** (2012) 004 [arXiv:1203.3011 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] M. Kopp, S. Hofmann and J. Weller, “Separate Universes Do Not Constrain Primordial Black Hole Formation,” Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 124025 [arXiv:1012.4369 [astro-ph.CO]].

[21] A. D. Linde and V. Mukhanov, “The curvaton web,” JCAP **0604** (2006) 009 [astro-ph/0511736].

[22] L. Dai, D. Jeong, M. Kamionkowski and J. Chluba, “The Pesky Power Asymmetry,” arXiv:1303.6949 [astro-ph.CO].

[23] F. Schmidt and L. Hui, “Cosmic Microwave Background Power Asymmetry from Non-Gaussian Modulation,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 011301 [Publisher-note **110** (2013) 059902] [arXiv:1210.2965 [astro-ph.CO]].

[24] A. L. Erickcek, C. M. Hirata and M. Kamionkowski, “A Scale-Dependent Power Asymmetry from Isocurvature Perturbations,” Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 083507 [arXiv:0907.0705 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] Z. -G. Liu, Z. -K. Guo and Y. -S. Piao, “Obtaining the CMB anomalies with a bounce from the contracting phase to inflation,” arXiv:1304.6527 [astro-ph.CO].

[26] Z. Chang and S. Wang, “Inflation and primordial power spectra at anisotropic spacetime inspired by Planck’s constraints on isotropy of CMB,” arXiv:1303.6058 [astro-ph.CO].

[27] L. Wang and A. Mazumdar, “Small non-Gaussianity and dipole asymmetry in the CMB,” arXiv:1304.6399 [astro-ph.CO].

[28] M. H. Namjoo, S. Baghram and H. Firouzjahi, “Hemispherical Asymmetry and Local non-Gaussianity: a Consistency Condition,” arXiv:1305.0813 [astro-ph.CO].